

**MORRISON FOERSTER**

250 WEST 55TH STREET  
NEW YORK  
NEW YORK 10019-9601  
  
TELEPHONE: 212 468 8000  
FACSIMILE: 212 468 7900  
  
WWW.MOFO.COM

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
AUSTIN, BEIJING, BERLIN, BOSTON,  
BRUSSELS, DENVER, HONG KONG,  
LONDON, LOS ANGELES, MIAMI,  
NEW YORK, PALO ALTO, SAN DIEGO,  
SAN FRANCISCO, SHANGHAI, SINGAPORE,  
TOKYO, WASHINGTON, D.C.

November 30, 2022

Writer's Direct Contact  
+1 (212) 336-4092  
KMooney@mofo.com

**[REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT  
SOUGHT TO BE SEALED]**

*By ECF*

The Honorable James Donato  
United States District Court for the Northern District of California  
San Francisco Courthouse, Courtroom 11, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
450 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: *Finjan LLC v. Palo Alto Networks, Inc.*, Case No. 3:14-cv-04908-JD (N.D. Cal.)

Dear Judge Donato:

Palo Alto Networks, Inc. ("PAN") submits this letter brief seeking an order compelling Finjan LLC ("Finjan") to produce documents concerning valuations of the asserted patents that Finjan is improperly withholding based on alleged privilege. PAN certifies that it has met and conferred with Finjan regarding this issue. PAN has worked with Finjan for more than five months to try to obtain some or all of these documents and to thereby narrow the dispute and minimize the burden on the Court. The parties have exchanged at least 33 letters and emails and have met and conferred three times. But the parties remain at an impasse and PAN is now forced to raise this issue with the Court.

PAN's discovery requests sought the production of documents concerning valuations of any of the asserted patents. (*See* PAN Interrog. No. 14; PAN RFP Nos. 91, 100.)<sup>1</sup> These documents are relevant to, *inter alia*, Finjan's claimed damages in this case. PAN believes that many of these documents were created and disclosed to Fortress Investment Group ("Fortress") and other third parties during a competitive sale process that Finjan conducted during the 2018-2020 time period — efforts that resulted in Fortress acquiring Finjan in July 2020 for \$43.9 million.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excerpts of PAN's discovery requests and Finjan's responses are attached as Exhibits B and C.

<sup>2</sup> Finjan described this sales process to its shareholders in a Solicitation/Recommendation Statement, filed June 24, 2020, *available at* <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1366340/000104746920003821/a2241956zsc14d9.htm>.

## MORRISON FOERSTER

The Honorable James Donato  
November 30, 2022  
Page Two

Finjan is wrongfully withholding these documents, identified as Entry Nos. 1-10 and 12-56 on its privilege log, dated September 3, 2021. (*See* Ex. A.) But the documents are not privileged or protected and, even if they were, Finjan has waived any such privilege or protection.

**A. Finjan Fails to Establish That the Withheld Documents Were Ever Protected By the Attorney-Client Privilege or Work Product Doctrine**

Finjan's withheld documents fall into two categories, neither of which includes any documents that were ever privileged or protected work product.

**Communications with Fortress and Unidentified Recipient No. 13.** Finjan is withholding [REDACTED] (See Ex. A, Entry Nos. 1-4, 8-10, 12.) These communications are not protected by attorney-client privilege because none of them are communications from Finjan to a Finjan attorney seeking legal advice or from a Finjan attorney to Finjan providing legal advice. Finjan also has not even made a colorable showing that these communications are entitled to work product protection and, in fact, does not claim that any of them were created or sent to [REDACTED] "because of" litigation. *See, e.g., In re Grand Jury Subpoena*, 357 F.3d 900, 908 (9th Cir. 2004) (document must be "created because of anticipated litigation and would not have been created in substantially similar form but for the prospect of litigation") (quoting *United States v. Adlman*, 134 F.3d 1194, 1195 (2d Cir. 1998)). These communications, in fact, appear to have been part of arm's-length negotiations with [REDACTED] when Finjan was soliciting [REDACTED].

**Spreadsheets and Presentations Sent to Potential Acquirers.** Finjan is withholding [REDACTED] (see Entry Nos. 16, 34-43, 52). Finjan has refused to disclose the identities of these persons or entities, but has confirmed in correspondence that they were "potential acquisition parties." Once again, these documents are not protected by attorney-client privilege because none of them are documents from Finjan to a Finjan attorney seeking legal advice or from a Finjan attorney to Finjan providing legal advice. Finjan also fails to provide information sufficient to justify its position that these documents were prepared, or sent to [REDACTED], "because of" litigation. *See In re Grand Jury Subpoena*, 357 F.3d at 908. Rather, the documents appear to have been created and broadly

## MORRISON FOERSTER

The Honorable James Donato  
November 30, 2022  
Page Three

disseminated at arm's-length to [REDACTED] because of Finjan's competitive sale process and third parties' interest in acquiring the company. Accordingly, they are not protected work product. *See Nidec Corp. v. Victor Co. of Japan*, 249 F.R.D. 575, 580 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (documents prepared "to further a commercial transaction in which the parties, if anything, have opposing interests").

**B. Even If the Withheld Documents Were Ever Protected, Finjan Has Waived Any Protections by Disclosing Them to Unaffiliated Third Parties as Part of Arm's-Length Business Negotiations**

Even if the withheld documents were privileged, Finjan has not established a requisite common legal interest with any of the unaffiliated "potential acquisition parties" and any alleged privileged or protections are therefore waived.

Finjan cannot establish a common legal interest with any potential acquisition party except for Fortress — and even then not until around June 9, 2020, or July 24, 2020, the dates that Finjan approved of the Merger Agreement with Fortress and that Fortress completed its acquisition, respectively. Before that time, Finjan's interests were directly opposite each of the several potential buyers. Finjan was trying to get the best deal it could from each potential buyer. Each potential buyer was trying to get the best deal it could from Finjan. These are pure business negotiations and are insufficient to establish a common interest. *See, e.g., Waymo LLC v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. 17-cv-00939-WHA(JSC), 2017 WL 2485382, at \*9 (N.D. Cal. June 8, 2017) (the common interest doctrine did not apply because "[a]t that time, Otto and Uber were on the opposite sides of a proposed acquisition with no obligation to consummate the transaction"); *Nidec*, 249 F.R.D. at 579-80 (common interest doctrine did not protect information exchanged during bidding process because parties "if anything, ha[d] opposing interests"). Finjan's reliance on *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc.*, 115 F.R.D. 308 (N.D. Cal. 1987) is misplaced because the parties in that case were furthering a joint legal interest in anticipated joint litigation. *Id.* at 310.

Finjan also cannot rely on the common interest doctrine here merely because it is in the business of IP and those arm's-length business negotiations, therefore, necessarily relate to IP. Courts have held that "evaluating patents to acquire and targets to assert those patents against are clearly business functions, and documents resulting from these functions cannot be categorized in sweeping assertions of privileges." *See, e.g., Thought, Inc. v. Oracle Corp.*, No. 12-cv-05601-WHO(MEJ), 2014 WL 3940294, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2014) (internal citation and quotation marks omitted).

Any argument that the existence of a confidentiality agreement with these third parties suffices to support a common legal interest is also baseless. *See, e.g., Waymo*, 2017 WL 2485382, at \*11-12; *Shopify Inc. v. Express Mobile, Inc.*, No. 20-mc-80091-JSC, 2020 WL 4732334, at \*8 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2020).

**IIIORRISON FOERSTER**

The Honorable James Donato  
November 30, 2022  
Page Four

Respectfully,

*/s/ Kyle Mooney*

Kyle Mooney  
Counsel for Palo Alto Networks, Inc.

Enclosures (Exhibits A-C)  
cc: All Counsel of Record (via ECF)

# **Exhibit A**

**DOCUMENT  
REDACTED IN  
ITS ENTIRETY**

# **Exhibit B**

MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)  
MJacobs@mofo.com  
MATTHEW A. CHIVVIS (CA SBN 251325)  
MChivvis@mofo.com  
DIEK O. VAN NORT (CA SBN 273823)  
DVanNort@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
Telephone: (415) 268-7000  
Facsimile: (415) 268-7522  
  
RUDY Y. KIM (CA SBN 99426)  
RudyKim@mofo.com  
COLETTE REINER MAYER (CA SBN 263630)  
CRMayer@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
755 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018  
Telephone: (650) 813-5600  
Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

Attorneys for Defendant  
PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.

ROSE S. LEE (CA SBN 294658)  
RoseLee@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
707 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 6000  
Los Angeles, California 90017-3543  
Telephone: (213) 892-5200  
Facsimile: (213) 892-5454

ERIC W. LIN (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Elin@mofo.com  
MICHAEL J. DESTEFANO (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Mdestefano@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
250 West 55th Street  
New York, New York 10019-9601  
Telephone: (212) 468-8000  
Facsimile: (212) 468-7900

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

FINJAN LLC,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,  
  
Defendant.

Case No. 4:14-CV-04908-PJH

**DEFENDANT PALO ALTO  
NETWORKS, INC.'S SECOND  
SET OF INTERROGATORIES  
TO FINJAN LLC (NO. 14)**

Judge: Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton

1 derived sufficient to permit rendering the records and information intelligible; (b) file folders with  
 2 tabs or labels or directories of files identifying documents must be produced intact with such  
 3 documents; and (c) documents attached to each other shall not be separated. Electronic records  
 4 and computerized information must be produced in the format ordered by the Court on April 20,  
 5 2021 in the Stipulation & Order Re: Discovery of Electronically Stored Information for Patent  
 6 Infringement (Dkt. No. 117).

7 5. The Interrogatories are continuing in nature. Finjan is required to timely  
 8 supplement these responses with any information discovered or identified subsequent to the  
 9 service of these Interrogatories, within a reasonable period of time following such discovery,  
 10 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e).

# **INTERROGATORIES**

## **INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

13 Describe with particularity any valuation conducted by Finjan, or by any other entity,  
 14 including but not limited to Fortress Investment Group LLC, Potential Transaction Partners,  
 15 and/or Party B, of any of the Asserted Patents by, without limitation, describing communications  
 16 regarding, and identifying all facts and circumstances relating to, all documents concerning, and  
 17 the persons most knowledgeable about, each valuation of the Asserted Patent(s).

20 Dated: May 12, 2021

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

22 By: /s/ Colette Reiner Mayer  
 23 Colette Reiner Mayer

24 Attorneys for Defendant  
 25 PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.



Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934) / brooks@fr.com  
Roger A. Denning (CA SBN 228998) / denning@fr.com  
Frank J. Albert (CA SBN 247741) / albert@fr.com  
K. Nicole Williams (CA SBN 291900) / nwilliams@fr.com  
Jared A. Smith (CA SBN 306576) / jasmith@fr.com  
Tucker N. Terhufen (CA SBN 311038) / terhufen@fr.com  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
12860 El Camino Real, Ste. 400  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

Susan Morrison (*Pro Hac Vice*) / morrison@fr.com  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
222 Delaware Avenue, 17th Floor  
P.O. Box 1114  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
Telephone: (302) 652-5070 / Fax: (302) 652-0607  
*Additional counsel listed on signature page*

***Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
FINJAN LLC***

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
(OAKLAND DIVISION)

FINJAN LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 14-cv-04908-PJH

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN LLC'S RESPONSES  
AND OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT  
PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.'S  
SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES  
(NO. 14)**

Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton  
Ctrm: 3, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33, Finjan LLC (“Finjan”) hereby serves its responses and objections to Palo Alto Networks, Inc. (“PAN”) Second Set of Interrogatories (No. 14).

### **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

Finjan incorporates its General Statement and Objections set forth in its Responses to Palo Alto Networks, Inc.’s First Set of Interrogatories served January 23, 2015.

### **DEFINITIONS**

1. Finjan objects to the definitions “Finjan,” “Plaintiff,” “you,” or “your”; “Fortress Investment Group LLC”; “Atlas”; and “Potential Transaction Partners” as overbroad and unduly burdensome. Finjan further objects to these as conflating distinct legal entities and actors and incorporating distinct entities and actors of which Finjan is not aware. Finjan will respond to these Interrogatories on behalf of Finjan LLC.

### **INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

Describe with particularity any valuation conducted by Finjan, or by any other entity, including but not limited to Fortress Investment Group LLC, Potential Transaction Partners, and/or Party B, of any of the Asserted Patents by, without limitation, describing communications regarding, and identifying all facts and circumstances relating to, all documents concerning, and the persons most knowledgeable about, each valuation of the Asserted Patent(s).

### **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

Finjan objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive to the extent it seeks information not relevant to any claim or defense of any party, is disproportional to the needs of the case and/or is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Finjan objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. Finjan further objects to this Request as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the claims and defenses in this case. Finjan objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it calls for information that is not in Finjan’s possession, custody, or control. Finjan objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information in the public domain. Finjan objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is subject to attorney-client privilege, attorney

1 work product, the common interest doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity. Finjan  
 2 objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks confidential, business, financial, proprietary  
 3 or sensitive information or trade secrets of third parties, which is subject to pre-existing protective  
 4 order(s) and/or confidentiality agreements. Finjan will not disclose any information subject to a  
 5 confidentiality agreement without the express consent of the concerned third party.

6  
 7  
 8 Dated: June 11, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

9 /s/ Phillip W. Goter

10 Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934)

brooks@fr.com

11 Roger A. Denning (CA SBN 228998)

denning@fr.com

12 Frank J. Albert (CA SBN 247741)

albert@fr.com

13 K. Nicole Williams (CA SBN 291900)

nwilliams@fr.com

14 Jared A. Smith (CA SBN 306576)

jasmith@fr.com

15 Tucker N. Terhufen (CA SBN 311038)

16 terhufen@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

17 12860 El Camino Real, Ste. 400

18 San Diego, CA 92130

Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

19  
 20 Aamir Kazi (*Pro Hac Vice*)

kazi@fr.com

21 Lawrence Jarvis (*Pro Hac Vice*)

22 jarvis@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

23 1180 Peachtree St. NE, 21st floor

24 Atlanta, GA 30309

Telephone: (404) 892-5005 / Fax: (404) 892-5002

25 Phillip W. Goter (*Pro Hac Vice*)

26 goter@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

27 3200 RBC Plaza, 60 South Sixth Street

28 Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 335-5070 / Fax: (612) 288-9696

1 Susan E. Morrison (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
2 morrison@fr.com  
3 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
4 222 Delaware Ave., 17th Floor  
5 P.O. Box 1114  
6 Wilmington, DE 19801  
7 Telephone: (302) 652-5070 / Fax: (302) 652-0607

8 Tracea Rice (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
9 trice@fr.com  
10 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
11 1000 Maine Ave. Ste. 1000  
12 Washington, DC 20024  
13 Telephone: (202) 783-5070 / Fax: (202) 783-2331

14  
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff FINJAN LLC  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# Exhibit C

MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)  
 MJacobs@mofo.com  
 MATTHEW A. CHIVVIS (CA SBN 251325)  
 MChivvis@mofo.com  
 DIEK O. VAN NORT (CA SBN 273823)  
 DVanNort@mofo.com  
 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 425 Market Street  
 San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
 Telephone: (415) 268-7000  
 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522  
 RUDY Y. KIM (CA SBN 99426)  
 RudyKim@mofo.com  
 COLETTE REINER MAYER (CA SBN 263630)  
 CRMayer@mofo.com  
 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 755 Page Mill Road  
 Palo Alto, California 94304-1018  
 Telephone: (650) 813-5600  
 Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

ROSE S. LEE (CA SBN 294658)  
 RoseLee@mofo.com  
 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 707 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 6000  
 Los Angeles, California 90017-3543  
 Telephone: (213) 892-5200  
 Facsimile: (213) 892-5454

ERIC W. LIN (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 Elin@mofo.com  
 MICHAEL J. DESTEFANO (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 Mdestefano@mofo.com  
 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 250 West 55th Street  
 New York, New York 10019-9601  
 Telephone: (212) 468-8000  
 Facsimile: (212) 468-7900

Attorneys for Defendant  
 PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 OAKLAND DIVISION

FINJAN LLC,  
 Plaintiff,  
 v.  
 PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,  
 Defendant.

Case No. 4:14-CV-04908-PJH

**DEFENDANT PALO ALTO  
 NETWORKS, INC.'S SECOND  
 SET OF REQUESTS FOR THE  
 PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS  
 AND THINGS TO FINJAN LLC  
 (NOS. 87-109)**

Judge: Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton

1 portfolio as a whole.

2 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 88:**

3 All documents provided to Fortress Investment Group LLC prior to its acquisition of  
4 Finjan concerning any of the Asserted Patents.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 89:**

6 All communications between Finjan, Inc. or Finjan Holdings, Inc., and Fortress  
7 Investment Group LLC prior to its acquisition of Finjan concerning PAN.

8 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 90:**

9 All documents provided to Fortress Investment Group LLC prior to its acquisition of  
10 Finjan concerning substituting Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP as counsel of record in any  
11 Finjan Litigation, including this Litigation.

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 91:**

13 All communications between Finjan, Inc. or Finjan Holdings, Inc., and Fortress  
14 Investment Group LLC concerning any valuation assigned to the Asserted Patents.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 92:**

16 All documents concerning any purchase price allocations associated with the acquisition  
17 of Finjan by Fortress Investment Group LLC.

18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 93:**

19 All communications between Finjan and any of its shareholders concerning the acquisition  
20 of Finjan by Fortress Investment Group LLC.

21 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 94:**

22 All communications between Finjan, Inc. or Finjan Holdings, Inc., and Fortress  
23 Investment Group LLC concerning any valuation assigned to pending claims for damages for  
24 alleged infringement of any of the Asserted Patents in any Finjan Litigation.

25 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 95:**

26 All communications between Finjan, Inc. or Finjan Holdings, Inc., and Fortress  
27 Investment Group LLC concerning any valuation assigned to pending claims for damages for any  
28 alleged infringement by PAN of any of the Asserted Patents.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 96:**

All communications between Finjan, Inc. or Finjan Holdings, Inc., and Fortress Investment Group LLC concerning any potential invalidity or unenforceability of any of the Asserted Patents.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 97:**

All communications between Finjan, Inc. or Finjan Holdings, Inc., and Fortress Investment Group LLC concerning any Prior Art.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 98:**

All communications between Finjan or Atlas, and any of the Potential Transaction Partners, including but not limited to Party B, concerning any valuation of the Asserted Patents or the Finjan patent portfolio as a whole.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 99:**

All communications between Finjan or Atlas, and any of the Potential Transaction Partners, including but not limited to Party B, concerning PAN.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 100:**

All communications between Finjan or Atlas, and any of the Potential Transaction Partners, including but not limited to Party B, concerning any valuation assigned to the Asserted Patents.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 101:**

All communications between Finjan or Atlas, and any of the Potential Transaction Partners, including but not limited to Party B, concerning any valuation assigned to pending claims for damages for alleged infringement of any of the Asserted Patents in any Finjan Litigation.

**REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 102:**

All communications between Finjan or Atlas, and any of the Potential Transaction Partners, including but not limited to Party B, concerning any valuation assigned to pending claims for damages for any alleged infringement by PAN of any of the Asserted Patents.



1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 109:**

2 All documents concerning any decision to correct or not correct any claims of priority in  
3 connection with prosecution of the '494 and '154 Patents.

4  
5  
6 Dated: May 12, 2021

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

7  
8 By: /s/ Colette Reiner Mayer  
9 Colette Reiner Mayer

10 Attorneys for Defendant  
11 PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934) / brooks@fr.com  
Roger A. Denning (CA SBN 228998) / denning@fr.com  
Frank J. Albert (CA SBN 247741) / albert@fr.com  
K. Nicole Williams (CA SBN 291900) / nwilliams@fr.com  
Jared A. Smith (CA SBN 306576) / jasmith@fr.com  
Tucker N. Terhufen (CA SBN 311038) / terhufen@fr.com  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
12860 El Camino Real, Ste. 400  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

Susan Morrison (*Pro Hac Vice*) / morrison@fr.com  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
222 Delaware Avenue, 17th Floor  
P.O. Box 1114  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
Telephone: (302) 652-5070 / Fax: (302) 652-0607  
*Additional counsel listed on signature page*

***Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
FINJAN LLC***

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
(OAKLAND DIVISION)

FINJAN LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 14-cv-04908-PJH

**PLAINTIFF FINJAN LLC'S RESPONSES  
AND OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT  
PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.'S  
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR  
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND  
THINGS (NOS. 87-109)**

Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton  
Ctm: 3, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

1 burdensome because it seeks production of “All communications.” Finjan further objects to this  
 2 Request to the extent it seeks documents and/or information not within Finjan’s possession, custody,  
 3 or control.

4 Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and to the extent that Finjan  
 5 understands this Request, Finjan responds that it has no non-protected information responsive to  
 6 this Request.

7 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 90:

8 All documents provided to Fortress Investment Group LLC prior to its acquisition of Finjan  
 9 concerning substituting Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP as counsel of record in any Finjan  
 10 Litigation, including this Litigation.

11 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 90:

12 Finjan incorporates its General Objections, as fully set forth herein. Finjan further objects  
 13 to this Request as seeking documents not relevant to any of the issues in this case, and for which  
 14 the burden of production substantially outweighs any need related to the issues in this case. Finjan  
 15 objects to this request as seeking information that is available from other, more convenient  
 16 sources, including from Fortress Investment Group. Finjan objects to this request as seeking  
 17 information protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the work product immunity,  
 18 the common interest protection, and/or any other applicable privilege or immunity. Finjan objects  
 19 to this request as overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks production of “All  
 20 documents.” Finjan further objects to this Request to the extent it seeks documents and/or  
 21 information not within Finjan’s possession, custody, or control.

22 Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and to the extent that Finjan  
 23 understands this Request, Finjan responds that it has no non-protected information responsive to  
 24 this Request.

25 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 91:

26 All communications between Finjan, Inc. or Finjan Holdings, Inc., and Fortress Investment  
 27 Group LLC concerning any valuation assigned to the Asserted Patents.

1 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 91:

2 Finjan incorporates its General Objections, as fully set forth herein. Finjan further objects  
 3 to this Request as seeking documents not relevant to any of the issues in this case, and for which the  
 4 burden of production substantially outweighs any need related to the issues in this case. Finjan  
 5 objects to this request as seeking information that is available from other, more convenient sources,  
 6 including from Fortress Investment Group LLC and Finjan Holdings, Inc. Finjan further objects to  
 7 this Request as seeking information protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the  
 8 work product immunity, the common interest protection, and/or any other applicable privilege or  
 9 immunity. Finjan objects to this request as overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks  
 10 production of “All communications.” Finjan further objects to this Request’s use of the terms  
 11 “valuation” as vague and ambiguous.

12 Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and to the extent that Finjan  
 13 understands this Request, Finjan responds that it has no non-protected information responsive to  
 14 this Request.

15 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 92:

16 All documents concerning any purchase price allocations associated with the acquisition of  
 17 Finjan by Fortress Investment Group LLC.

18 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 92:

19 Finjan incorporates its General Objections, as fully set forth herein. Finjan further objects  
 20 to this Request as seeking documents not relevant to any of the issues in this case, and for which the  
 21 burden of production substantially outweighs any need related to the issues in this case. Finjan  
 22 objects to this request as seeking information that is publicly available. Finjan further objects to this  
 23 Request as seeking information protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the work  
 24 product immunity, the common interest protection, and/or any other applicable privilege or  
 25 immunity. Finjan objects to this request as overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks  
 26 production of “All documents.” Finjan further objects to this Request’s use of the terms “purchase  
 27 price allocations” as vague and ambiguous. Finjan further objects to this Request, including its use  
 28 of the terms “purchase price allocations,” as seeking information unrelated to the Asserted Patents.

1 Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and to the extent that Finjan  
2 understands this Request, Finjan responds that it has no non-protected information responsive to  
3 this Request.

4  
5 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 100:

6 All communications between Finjan or Atlas, and any of the Potential Transaction Partners,  
7 including but not limited to Party B, concerning any valuation assigned to the Asserted Patents.

8 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 100:

9 Finjan incorporates its General Objections, as fully set forth herein. Finjan further objects  
10 to this Request as seeking documents not relevant to any of the issues in this case, and for which the  
11 burden of production substantially outweighs any need related to the issues in this case. Finjan  
12 objects to this request as seeking information that is publically available. Finjan objects to this  
13 request as seeking information protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the work  
14 product immunity, the common interest protection, and/or any other applicable privilege or  
15 immunity. Finjan further objects to this Request's use of the term "valuation" as vague and  
16 ambiguous. Finjan objects to this request as overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks  
17 production of "All communications." Finjan further objects to this Request to the extent it seeks  
18 documents and/or information not within Finjan LLC's possession, custody, or control.

19 Subject to the foregoing general and specific objections, and to the extent that Finjan  
20 Holdings understands this Request, Finjan responds that it has no non-protected information  
21 responsive to this Request.

22 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 101:

23 All communications between Finjan or Atlas, and any of the Potential Transaction Partners,  
24 including but not limited to Party B, concerning any valuation assigned to pending claims for  
25 damages for alleged infringement of any of the Asserted Patents in any Finjan Litigation.

26 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 101:

27 Finjan incorporates its General Objections, as fully set forth herein. Finjan further objects  
28 to this Request as seeking documents not relevant to any of the issues in this case, and for which the

documents, to the extent they exist, that were in Finjan's possession, custody and control and could be located after a reasonable search.

Dated: June 11, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Phillip W. Goter

Juanita R. Brooks (CA SBN 75934)

brooks@fr.com

Roger A. Denning (CA SBN 228998)

denning@fr.com

Frank J. Albert (CA SBN 247741)

albert@fr.com

K. Nicole Williams (CA SBN 291900)

nwilliams@fr.com

Jared A. Smith (CA SBN 306576)

jasmith@fr.com

Tucker N. Terhufen (CA SBN 311038)

terhufen@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

12860 El Camino Real, Ste. 400

San Diego, CA 92130

Telephone: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

Aamir Kazi (*Pro Hac Vice*)

kazi@fr.com

Lawrence Jarvis (*Pro Hac Vice*)

jarvis@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

1180 Peachtree St. NE, 21st floor

Atlanta, GA 30309

Telephone: (404) 892-5005 / Fax: (404) 892-5002

Phillip W. Goter (*Pro Hac Vice*)

goter@fr.com

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

3200 RBC Plaza, 60 South Sixth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 335-5070 / Fax: (612) 288-9696

1 Susan E. Morrison (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
2 morrison@fr.com  
3 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
4 222 Delaware Ave., 17th Floor  
5 P.O. Box 1114  
6 Wilmington, DE 19801  
7 Telephone: (302) 652-5070 / Fax: (302) 652-0607

8 Tracea Rice (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
9 trice@fr.com  
10 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
11 1000 Maine Ave. Ste. 1000  
12 Washington, DC 20024  
13 Telephone: (202) 783-5070 / Fax: (202) 783-2331

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff FINJAN LLC  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28